

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 18 and 20 – 23 remain pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 13 – 17, and 24 – 29 have been canceled. New claim 30 has been added.

Claims 25, 28, and 29 submitted as new claims in the prior response of November 18, 2003, have been asserted in the Official Action to be directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed as being directed to a composite structure comprising a mat and a yarn. Claim 23 as amended, likewise is being asserted to be directed to a composite mat. The Examiner accordingly has stated to these claims are subject to restriction and are being withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant has canceled these claims in the current response.

Claim 27 has been objected to because of a cited informality. Claim 27 has been canceled and redrafted as new claim 30, which is believed to correct the informality and therefore remove the objection.


Claims 1, 4, 6, 13, 16 – 18, 20 – 22, and 26 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hall, et al.* ('3208125). Additionally, claims 7 – 12, have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hall, et al.* in view of *Hatch (Textile Science)*. While Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's rejection of these claims in view of *Hall, et al.*, in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18 to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 24, respectively, which claims previously were stated to be allowable, and has now canceled claims 2, 5, 13 – 17, and 24 – 29. Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 18, and 20 – 23, as well as new claim 30 are not anticipated, and thus are patentable over the cited art of record.

Claims 1, 13 and 18 have also been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,375. As noted above, claim 13 has been canceled. Applicant submits herewith a new terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR § 1.321, which disclaimer is believed to overcome the rejection of claims 1 and 18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. It is accordingly respectfully requested that this rejection now be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 24 and 27 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but further were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As stated above, the limitations of claims 2 and 24 have been added to claims 1 and 18, respectively, and claims 2 and 24 canceled. Claim 27 now has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 30, which is likewise believed to be allowable over the cited art of record.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 6 – 12, 18, 20 – 23 and 30, as now pending in this application, are not anticipated and are patentable over the cited art of record. An early notice of allowance accordingly is solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding the foregoing response or the attached terminal disclaimer pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.321, he is invited and urged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


D. Scott Sudderth
Reg. # 34,026

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, Georgia 30357-0037
(404) 962-7527